

Serial No. 09/449,270

PATENT

### REMARKS

In the Office action of February 29, 2008, claims 1 to 11 and 18 to 42 were pending of which claims 1 to 13, 18 to 31, 33 and 36 to 42 were rejected and claims 32, 34 and 35 were objected to.

In particular:

- Claims 25 to 31, 37, 38 and 40 were rejected under 35 USC 112
- Claims 1 to 11, 18 to 27, 29, 30, 33 and 40 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Campbell et al (US 6,193,572)
- Claims 36 to 39 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell et al (US 6,193,572) in view of St. Germain et al (US5,534,007)
- Claims 41 and 42 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell et al (US 6,193,572) in view of Goicochea (US 5,609,627).

### CLAIM AMENDMENTS

We thank the Examiner for bringing to our attention the objections under 35 U.S.C. 112. Claims 25, 37, 38 and 40 are amended to correct these claims.

Amendments are also made in claims 24, 26, 33, 34, and 39 to clarify terminology, to tighten up the claim language and to make it consistent throughout.

Claim 24 is also amended to include within it the subject matter of claim 32 and part of the subject matter of claim 26.

Claims 1 to 11, 18 to 23 and 32 have been cancelled.

We submit that in making these amendments to the claims no new subject matter has been added.

### DISCUSSION

We thank the Examiner for his indication of allowance of some of the claims upon clarification of the 35 U.S.C. 112 matters. Applicants have decided to add the

MAY 12 2008

PAGE 15/15 : RCV AT 5/12/2008 9:43:36 AM [Eastern Daylight Time] : SVR:USPTO-EFXXRF-5/3 : DNIS:2738300 : CSID:8123309049 : DURATION (mm:ss):02:30

Serial No. 09/449,270

PATENT

subject matter of claim 32 in claim 24 from which it depended. Claim 32 was allowed subject to being amended by being rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. This has in effect been done by the adding claim 32 into claim 24. Hence we submit that claim 24 is now allowable and claims 25 to 31 and 33 to 42 which depend from claim 24 are also allowable.

The rejection of anticipation of claims 1 to 11 and 18 to 23 is, we submit, rendered moot by the cancellation of these claims.

The rejection of patentability to claims 36 to 39 and 41 and 42 is rendered moot by the amendment of the claim or claims from which they depend.

The reexamination and reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested, and it is further requested that the application be passed to issue.

Although the foregoing discussion is believed to be dispositive of the issues in this case, applicants' attorney requests a telephone interview with the Examiner to further discuss any unresolved issues remaining after the Examiner's consideration of this amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

David Ernest Hartley  
Michael Lawrence Brown

Date:

May 9, 2008

By

Richard J. Godlewski  
Richard J. Godlewski  
Reg. No. 30,086  
(812) 330-1824